

Appl. No. 10/672,084
Amdt. Dated Jan. 5, 2005
Reply to Office Action of October 5, 2004

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication of allowability of claim 6.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claim 1-5, 7-17 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Takada et al. (6,341,966).

Applicants respectfully transverse the rejection due to the following reasons.

Regarding claim 1, an extender for use between two connectors defined therein comprises a frame having a body portion and **two receiving ports** at opposite ends thereof adapted for respectively receiving said two connectors, a circuit board attached to the body portion of the frame, the circuit board having conductive traces disposed along at least one side thereof and **opposite end portions respectively extending into the two receiving ports of the frame.**

Takada et al. discloses an extender for use between two connectors (10) comprising a frame (40) having a body portion and **two flange portions (43) (FIG. 2, column 4, lines 39-41)**, two circuit boards (20) attached to opposite sides of the body portion of the frame, the circuit board having conductive trace disposed along at least one side. However, **it is noted that the two flange portions (43) are not the receiving ports as described by Examiner.** In addition, **the circuit boards are also not inserted into the flange portions (43).** Therefore, the receiving ports defined in claim 1 and claim 10 are distinguishably different from flange portions (43) which are described in Takada et al. Thus, claim 1 and claim 10 are believed to be patentable over Takada et al.

Claim 2 should be allowable since it is directly dependent from the claim 1.

Appl. No. 10/672,084

Amdt. Dated Jan. 5, 2005

Reply to Office Action of October 5, 2004

Claim 3 and Claim 12 should be allowable since claim 3 and claim 12 discloses the frame comprising **two receiving sections** at opposite ends thereof, the pair of receiving sections defining said receiving port, which are not described explicitly or unexplicitly in figures or description by Takada et al.

Claim 4 and Claim 13 should be allowable since claim 4 and claim 13 discloses the circuit board comprising a pair of **shoulders on opposite sides of each end portion, each shoulder abutting against the bottom of a corresponding receiving section of the frame**. Apparently, the shoulders defined in claim 4 are different from the tapered portions in Takada described by Examiner.

Claim 5, 7-9, 11 and 15-17 should be allowable since they are dependent from claim 1 or claim 10, directly or indirectly.

Claim 20 as amended, essentially incorporates all limitations of the original claim 21 therewith and defines the frame being fastened to **ANOTHER printed circuit board on which the housing is mounted**. *Please be noted that this printed circuit board is **NOT** either one of the earlier mentioned two spaced circuit boards in claim 20.* The Examiner indicates that in Takata et al. the frame is fastened to a printed circuit board on which the housing is mounted (by protrusion 44). It is true while also false when applied to the amended claim 20.

As emphasized before, in the amended claim 20 the frame is fastened to **another** printed circuit board which is NOT of either of the already mentioned two spaced circuit boards which are respectively received in the connectors. In the amended claim 20, applicant intentionally uses different terms of "**circuit boards**" and "**printed circuit board**" to differentiate these two type boards. Quite differently, in Takata et al. the frame is fastened to the printed circuit board which is definitely the same ONE of the two spaced printed circuit boards which are respectively received in the connectors, rather than outside of the connectors for the connector-mounting purpose.

Thus, Takata et al. can not either anticipate or render obvious the invention as

Appl. No. 10/672,084
Amdt. Dated Jan. 5, 2005
Reply to Office Action of October 5, 2004

defined in the amended claim 20. Allowance of claim 20 is respectfully requested.

Claims 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ramirez et al. (5,800,186).

In response to the above rejection, applicants has amended claim 18 to incorporate novel limitations thereto for removing the rejections thereof. The amendment is supported by the original disclosure of the specification without introducing any new matter. By such amendment, applicants believe that the amended claim 18 is clearly patentable over the cited prior art.

Claim 19 should be allowable since it directly dependent from the amended claim 18.

In view of the above claim amendments and remarks, the subject application is believed to be in a condition for allowance and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Korsunsky et al.

By 

Wei Te Chung

Registration No.: 43,325
Foxconn International, Inc.
P. O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive,
Santa Clara, CA 95050
Tel No.: (408) 919-6137